

SACRAMENTO RIVER WATER RELIABILITY STUDY

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

DATE: October 2, 2008, 10 to 11 a.m.

LOCATION: 1325 J Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBJECT: USACE Pre-Application Meeting

PARTICIPANTS:

Erin Foresman (EPA)	Heather Trejo (PCWA)
Erin Huss (USACE)	Anna Fock (MWH)
Lisa Gibson (USACE)	Cindy Jones (MWH)
Jana Milliken (USFWS)	Meredith Parkin (MWH)
Sharon McHale (Reclamation)	Stephanie Parsons (ESA)

AGENDA:

1. Introduction
2. SRWRS Overview
3. SRWRS permitting approach
4. Feedback and comments

SUMMARY:

General

1. Zachery Simmons is the designated project manager of the SRWRS. Currently, he is in Texas on hurricane assignment.
 - a. During Zachery's absence, Erin Hess and Lisa Gibbons are the points of contact.
 - b. Involvement of Erin and Lisa in the SRWRS after Zachery's return is currently uncertain.
2. Today's meeting goals:
 - a. To provide a general introduction of the SRWRS Elverta Diversion Alternative (the proposed project under ESA consultation) for the 404 permit agencies.
 - b. To get USACE's input on approach of completing the SRWRS Draft EIS/EIR.
3. Under ESA compliance, the SRWRS effects on CVP/SWP system are addressed under the ongoing OCAP consultation. For the SRWRS footprint effects, they are addressed through the SRWRS biological assessments, which were completed and submitted to USFWS and NMFS for review in May 2008.
 - a. The SRWRS team is currently in the process of principled negotiation with USFWS to identify mitigations for the entire proposed alternative.
 - i. MOA between USFWS and the cost-sharing partners are the mechanism to handle the interrelated effects.
 - ii. Reclamation will ultimately be responsible for the enforcement of the above MOA under the SRWRS.

- b. NMFS has not replied Reclamation's request on the status update of the SRWRS NMFS BA review.

404 permit process

1. In order to issue a 404 permit for the SRWRS, USACE is required to complete an EA or EIS for NEPA compliance to determine the proposed project is the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA) per the 404(b)(1) Guidelines. Then, USACE will issue its own decision document for the approval of 404 permit.
2. USACE is currently not a cooperating agency for the SRWRS EIS/EIR
 - a. USACE cannot assume the SRWRS EIS/EIR fully addresses the LEDPA analysis.
 - b. USACE can review the current EIS/EIR wetland effect analysis and provide comments.
3. A complete LEDPA analysis would require wetland delineation for the SRWRS.
 - a. USACE suggested conducting wetland delineation in spring during the wet season to best identify wetland characteristics.
 - b. Verification of delineation and jurisdictional determination could take USACE up to 2 years to complete.
 - c. If requested, USACE can provide approved wetland delineation in Sacramento and Placer counties.

Elverta intake and raw water pipelines

4. The proposed Elverta intake and raw water pipeline will be in the vicinity of SAFCA Natomas Levee Improvement Project.
 - a. Environmental compliance/permitting processes of the SAFAC Natomas Levee Improvement Project are ongoing.
 - b. SRWRS met with SAFCA on facility and mitigation coordination in August 2008. The coordination is ongoing.
5. The proposed raw water pipelines would go over the top of existing levee or SAFCA proposed levee:
 - a. USACE suggested that it is very likely for the SRWRS to acquire a 408 permission to alter existing flood control structures.
 - b. USACE suggested the SRWRS to coordinate with SAFCA's 408 permission through:
 - i. Megan Naggie (project manager)
 - ii. Liz Holland (Planning division)

North Natomas Water Treatment Plant

1. The proposed North Natomas WTP locations are inside the Natomas Basin and on the north side of the Elverta Road.
 - a. The exact plant location has not been determined.
 - b. Some parcels within the potential location have been acquired by the Natomas Conservancy for habitat preserve.
 - c. The regulatory agencies will not allow the WTP to be located in side the habitat preserve.
2. In all SRWRS effect analysis for the North Natomas WTP, the conventional design was used to maximize the potential effects for conservative purpose.

- a. The WTP acreage would be up to 100 acres.
- b. The open-water features of the new WTP could potentially attract wildlife and increase bird strike risk to SMF.
- c. The SRWRS met with FAA and Sacramento County Airport System in 2006 and 2007 on potential risks of bird strike hazard from the open waters of the new WTP. Evaluation results were documented in the SRWRS Wildlife Hazard Evaluation Report, which is an appendix of the EIS/EIR.

Treated water pipeline

1. The proposed treated water pipelines would be up to 30 miles long.
2. The proposed alignments would be underneath existing right-of-way and routed to minimize direct wetland effects.
3. USACE suggested MWH to review the natural gas pipelines proposed by PG&E in the north Natomas area.

EPA inputs

1. There will be a dedicated EPA person from the Environmental Review Department to provide comments on the SRWRS effect during the 404 permitting process.
2. EPA needs more information on:
 - a. Other alternatives
 - b. Growth inducement effects
 - c. Off-site analysis for the North Natomas WTP.

ACTION ITEMS:

1. USACE will assist in the identification of the NMFS reviewer for the SRWRS BA. Sharon McHale will coordinate with the NMFS contact.
2. EPA will provide the name of the dedicated reviewer of SRWRS analysis.
3. Reclamation will provide the latest wetland effect analysis to USACE for review.
4. USACE will provide the route of natural gas pipelines proposed by PG&E in the north Natomas area.